

From: John Rook
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 26, 2003 9:15 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

John Rook (JHRook@earthlink.net) writes:

I invited you to read the comments of broadcasters concerning radio deregulation.

www.JohnRook.com

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 66.82.9.17
Remote IP address: 66.82.9.17

From: pnewbrough8@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 26, 2003 9:28 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Penny Newbrough
436 Shell Court West
nla
Columbus, Ohio 43213

cc
Senator Mike DeWine
Representative David Hobson
Senator George Voinovich

From: pnwrbrough8@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Feb 26.2003 9:28 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

RECEIVED

FEB 26 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Penny Newbrough
436 Shell Court West
n/a
Columbus, Ohio 43213

cc:
Senator Mike DeWine
Representative David Hobson
Senator George Voinovich

From: ljeanj25@yahoo.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 26, 2003 11:40 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Laura Johnson
920 SE Essex ST
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

cc:
Representative Martin Sabo
Senator Mark Dayton
Senator Norm Coleman

From: ljeanj25@yahoo.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Feb 26, 2003 11:40 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Laura Johnson
920 SE Essex ST
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

cc:
Representative Martin Sabo
Senator Mark Dayton
Senator Norm Coleman

From: Kelly Steyaert
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 6:15 AM
Subject: media debate

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Will Hear Debate On Broadening Media Ownership

Companies own enough already! It is already a monopoly and considering what little we have there should be NO debate. Most news and media today is dumbed down and sterile. As a taxpayer I demand that there are no changes in the ownership rules and if they **do** change they should be in favor of breaking up such monopolies.

Peter Steyaert

RECEIVED

From: Kelly Steyaert
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 27.2003 6:16 AM
Subject: Media debate

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Will Hear Debate On Broadening Media Ownership

Companies own enough already! It **is** already a monopoly and considering what little we have there should be NO debate. Most news and media today is dumbed down and sterile. **As** a taxpayer I demand that there are no changes in the ownership rules and if they do change they should be in favor of breaking up such monopolies.

Peter Steyaert

From: Barb Sacheli
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 8:07 AM
Subject: Keep Ban on Media Cross-ownership

RECEIVED**MAR - 5 2003**

Dear Commissioner, Please help keep the remaining diversity and competition we have in the media by NOT changing the media cross-ownership regulations. I am hoping you will focus on keeping diversity and limit the concentration of media power. It is critical that one corporation NOT control the news media - esp. in CT. Please keep the ban on cross-ownership. Thank you for your time and support Sincerely, Barbara Sacheli. Enfield. CT.

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

From: Barb Sacheli
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 8:11 AM
Subject: Keep Ban on Media Cross-ownership

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner, Please help keep the remaining diversity and competition we have in the media by NOT changing the media cross-ownership regulations. I am hoping you will focus on keeping diversity and limit the concentration of media power. It is critical that one corporation NOT control the news media - especially in CT. Please keep the ban on cross-ownership Thank you for your time and support.
Sincerely, Barbara Sacheli, Enfield, CT.

EC

From: Rev. Mark Chaffin
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 27.2003 8:46 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Rev. Mark Chaffin (chaffinm@nycap.rr.com) writes:

I urge you to take a vigorous stand to widen and enhance national dialogue on media consolidation. I further urge you and your fellow commissioners to maintain current ownership restrictions. As a democracy we can only thrive when a variety of news sources and positions are given wide-spread opportunity to reach average citizens. Only then can we have informed citizen decision-makers and voters. The Walmartization of the media is anti-democracy, aids corporate manipulation of information for vested financial gain, and leads to an evisceration of public involvement in critical issues of our national life.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.195.243.136
Remote IP address: 24.195.243.136

RECEIVED

From: Jeanne Dowdle
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 9:20 AM
Subject: media mardet share restrictions

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I beleive we need to promote diversity in the media, not monopoly. this includes, news, radio, and television. Without this diversity, we have **no** guarrentee of correct information, nor do we have choice in selecting our entertainment, or prioritizing our individual interests. Please support indepent media.

Thank you.

Jeanne Dowdle

Hartsel. CO

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: Steve Nordstrom
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 9:47 AM
Subject: Media Ownership Rules changes

Mr Powell

As a consumer, I am opposed to any changes in media ownership rules that allow large corporations to own more stations than they do now. I am particularly opposed to changing rules that allow companies like Clear Channel to dominate the local/national radio landscape, as they do now, so that local stations cannot compete against them. I am in favor of a rollback of rules that have allowed Clear Channel to own over 1,200 stations nation-wide.

I suggest that no single company be allowed to own more than 20% of the total media outlets (print, cable, satellite, television, radio, internet, cellular) in any local area. Even that may be too much, because in theory that means that just five media giants could control all of the media channels and content in a community

Thank you.

Regards,

Steve Nordstrom
206E Royal Pines Drive
Huntsville, AL 35806

From: Phil Dolsen
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 27.2003 10:37 AM
Subject: media ownership

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Sir

the FCC has already gon too far in allowing large orginzations to own
multipal radio stations. The personality of the local radio station has
been changed and has destroyed its unique local flavor. For What?
GREED..

Phil Dolsen

From: jayleenrichards@cs.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 11:30 AM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein.

I am a mother of a four year old son and I urge the FCC to consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected

Sincerely,

Jayleen Richards
1001 Mockingbird Lane
Fairfield, California 94533

cc:
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
Representative Ellen Tauscher

From: jayleenrichards@cs.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 11:30 AM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

RECEIVED

FEB - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps,

I am a mother of a four year old son and I urge the FCC to consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely.

Jayleen Richards
1001 Mockingbird Lane
Fairfield, California 94533

cc
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
Representative Ellen Tauschei

From: jnelsonr@tampabay.rr.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 12:17 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Jane Nelson-Ruffin
6430 Polk St.
New Port Richey, Florida 34653

cc
Senator Bob Graham
Representative Michael Bilirakis
Senator Bill Nelson

From: jnelsonr@tampabay.rr.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 12:17 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Jane Nelson-Ruffin
6430 Polk St.
New Port Richey, Florida 34653

cc.
Senator Bob Graham
Representative Michael Bilirakis
Senator Bill Nelson

RECEIVED

From: karen galligan
To: Cornmissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 27.2003 12:26 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

MAR -- 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

karen galligan (louisegal1@yahoo.com) writes:

i am commenting on the upcoming vote on relaxing the restrictions on cross ownership. this is a disaster for the public and a boon to the owners. clear channel **is** a good example. 1200 stations and you get the same thing on all of the stations. they have run the little guy out of business and they play the same thing. the media is in sad shape in this country now. if you want to know something about the world you have to read an overseas newspaper or watch the bbc please vote against this cross ownership agenda.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 12.44.221.115
Remote IP address: 12.44.221.115

From: Terrance A. Davis
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 12:32 PM
Subject: FCC Debates Media Ownership Rules

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Sir

I read with interest the article below

<http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/national/AP-Media-Ownership.html>

From the article

--

The agency's five commissioners heard public and industry comments at a hearing as one of the final steps in its review, which will probably be completed in May.

It is widely believed that Powell and two other Republicans on the commission want to loosen regulations.

Commissioner Michael Copps, a Democrat, said the decisions the FCC will make could alter the landscape of news and entertainment programming.

"I am concerned because I think we don't yet know the potential implications of our actions," Copps said.

David Croteau, a sociology professor at Virginia Commonwealth University, echoed Copps' concerns.

"We have enough evidence now to serve as a warning," he said in prepared remarks. "Less regulation will be a windfall for a few giant media corporations. It is likely to be a huge mistake for the rest of us."

--

I am writing you to voice my opposition to repealing any restrictions that will result in fewer people owning a larger share of media.

Rather, I think restrictions should be tightened in the following areas.

Forbid control of telecommunications / cable networks by news organizations
(the example here would be AOL/TW with CNN and TW Cable broadband)

Justification -- by controlling the cable, they control the channel selection.

or cost of carriage, and thus they control what America sees

Lessen the percentage of coverage a single media company could control
(currently I think its 35 % by reports I've read.)

Justification -- news organizations have become corporate offices with little

interest in pursuing the truth as there is risk associated with creating attention some other corporation might view as detrimental. Smaller organizations would promote more competition, more aggressive reporting, more truth for America, unhindered by corporate profit issues.

Continue ban on owning news / television media within a market.

Justification -- obviously the reasons for this regulation have hardly changed,

in fact there is more justification than ever, in particular with the degree of large scale corporate corruption recently. The article states
""cross-ownership" of a newspaper and a broadcast station can enhance the quality and quantity of news and local information'
Enhance a single viewpoint assuredly.

Implement restriction on control of satellites by media companies.

Justification -- by controlling the satellite, they control the channel selection,
or cost of carriage, and thus they control what America sees

In short, its clear that what keeps America informed is a free press not controlled by a small group of powerful investors, free to report on issues large corporations could find uncomfortable for a variety of reasons, with opportunity for more viewpoints not less. The emergence of the Internet and Satellite communications broadens the need for regulation, not lessens it.

Thanks

T Davis

From: Terrance A. Davis
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu. Feb 27, 2003 12:32 PM
Subject: FCC Debates Media Ownership Rules

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

Sir,

I read with interest the article below.

<http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/national/AP-Media-Ownership.html>
 From the article

--

The agency's five commissioners heard public and industry comments at a hearing as one of the final steps in its review, which will probably be completed in May.

It is widely believed that Powell and two other Republicans on the commission want to loosen regulations.

Commissioner Michael Copps, a Democrat, said the decisions the FCC will make could alter the landscape of news and entertainment programming.

"I am concerned because I think we don't yet know the potential implications of our actions," Copps said.

David Croteau, a sociology professor at Virginia Commonwealth University echoed Copps' concerns.

"We have enough evidence now to serve as a warning," he said in prepared remarks. "Less regulation will be a windfall for a few giant media corporations. It is likely to be a huge mistake for the rest of us."

I am writing you to voice my opposition to repealing any restrictions that will result in fewer people owning a larger share of media.

Rather, I think restrictions should be tightened in the following areas

Forbid control of telecommunications / cable networks by news organizations
 (the example here would be AOL/TW with CNN and TW Cable broadband)

Justification -- by controlling the cable, they control the channel selection,
 or cost of carriage, and thus they control what America sees

Lessen the percentage of coverage a single media company could control
 (currently I think its 35 % by reports I've read.)

Justification -- news organizations have become corporate offices with little
 interest in pursuing the truth as there is risk associated with creating attention some other corporation might view as detrimental. Smaller organizations would promote more competition, more aggressive reporting, more truth for America, unhindered by corporate profit issues,

Continue ban on owning news / television media within a market

Justification -- obviously the reasons for this regulation have hardly changed,

in fact there is more justification than ever, in particular with the degree of large scale corporate corruption recently. The article states
""cross-ownership" of a newspaper and a broadcast station can enhance the quality and quantity of news and local information'
Enhance a single viewpoint assuredly.

Implement restriction on control of satellites by media companies.

Justification -- by controlling the satellite, they control the channel selection,

or cost of carriage, and thus they control what America sees.

In short, its clear that what keeps America informed is a free press not controlled by a small group of powerful investors, free to report on issues large corporations could find uncomfortable for a variety of reasons, with opportunity for more viewpoints not less. The emergence of the Internet and Satellite communications broadens the need for regulation, not lessens it.

Thanks

T Davis

RECEIVED

From: Lorrin Palagi
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 12:34 PM
Subject: Clear Channel

MAR - 5 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Adelstein.

The following is an excerpt from a recent Fortune article. Does this sound **like** a company that serves the public interest to you?

FORTUNE

Tuesday, February 18, 2003

By Christine Y. Chen

Lowry Mays is the Big Daddy of radio. The founder and CEO of Clear Channel, Mays oversees 1,233 radio stations with some 100 million listeners across all 50 states, and runs a company with \$8 billion in revenues and a \$23 billion market cap. But ask Mays about what he does for a living and you won't hear much about musicians or how to bring up ratings or who's the best DJ. Those things don't interest him much. Truth is, Mays isn't that passionate about what goes out over the airwaves. **As** long as his broadcasts sell ads, he's happy. "If anyone said we were in the radio business, it wouldn't be someone from our company," says Mays, 67. "We're not in the business of providing news and information. We're not in the business of providing well-researched music. We're simply in the business of selling our customers products."

Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to read this

Sincerely,

Lorrin Palagi

Lorrin Palagi
Zapoleon Media Strategies
13002 Bainbridge Trail
Houston, TX 77065
(832) 912-6880 (603) 215-5268 fax
www.zapoleon.com

From: Robert.Rafn@libertysite.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 2:10 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Copps.

I just want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your courage and insight in doing what you can to put the brakes on any further loosening of media ownership rules and deregulation of the broadcast industry

I consider this to be possibly the most important issue of the century, because it is the issue from which all other issues stem. Information is the seed on public action, and what Chairman Powell is considering would have a profound effect on what information the public does or, more importantly, does not get in order to be able to improve their circumstances.

As a hypothetical example fo what I mean, say that the media ownership rules are modified to allow only two corporations to control all our major media. And say, hypothetically, that our President at that time is contemplating a first-strike war that is likely to set a horrible precedent in international relations, will likely increase terrorist attacks against our country, enrage our enemies and alienate most of our allies. But say, hypothetically, that one of our two only media parent corporations is a weapons manufacturer like, oh, say, General Electric, which would stand to profit heavily from such a war. And say, hypothetically, that the other media parent corporation is an electronics company like, oh, say, Sony, that could hypothetically manufacture high-tech items that could be very useful in a military action as well. In such a hypothetical situation, where both companies stand to profit from such a "pre-emptive war," and they both know that war is not only in their own interests but in each others' interests (but quite likely not in the public's interest), how likely is it that the public would get complete, accurate information and opinions about such a war from these two sole media behemoths?

Even now, the majority of opinions that we hear on the major TV networks regarding a "per-emptive war" with Iraq come from "experts" - generals, government officials and military strategists. Yet the majority of public opinion is against the kind of war that our President seems eager to throw us into without UN support. Instead of getting to hear more voices on this issue and more information about how we can stop it and what our role has been around the world, we get celebrity interviews about the latest movie coming out.

This is just one example of thousands that I could list where the public interest is grossly underserved as is right now, and would be even more horrendously underserved by any deregulation or further loosening Of the media ownership rules.

The task you are embarking on - taking a stand and trying to bring the public into the process - is a vitally important one. I doubt that any loosening of the ownership rules could be undone, and for those who need proof, as well as proof that even now the media are not serving the public, a prime example is how likely the major commercial TV networks will be to breathe a peep to the public about your nationwide forums on the future use

and control of the public's priceless property - the airwaves. Certainly if any information is in the public interest, it is information on when and where the future of communication in the US will be decided and why that is important.

Anyway, I don't invoke the name of God often or lightly, but I want to say, Chairman Copps, God bless you for the courageous work that you are doing. Please keep up your essential fight on behalf of we the public, and please take every opportunity let us know what we need to do to be heard by the FCC.

Thank you,

Robert Rafn
P.O. Box 75363
St. Paul, M N 55175
(651) 554-9926
rrafn@libertysite.com